

-TR

of. Kieber + Pries

was call for new
look at past we.

crises (like me!)

Quest for Supremacy:

was it added to
control (event?)

esp (yes?)

(a contemporary
discussion of Supremacy,
to and, practices...

- see "Cuban
Mind ^{crisis} as a study
of historical deception"

- Political Uses of
Madness;

Post-CW focus on
"madness"

Elitist. Force

(Theory + Practice of
Blackmail.

Bring in my own learning:

Assurance:

Mist-taking

How do catastrophes
happen?

- Deletion of
damage-limitation

(Not to appear
unrealistically
reluctant about limiting
damage.)

TR

7-13-10

Bring its Proposal:

- Georgia/Ukraine

McCain: We are all

Georgians...

NATO EU at

border of Russia

(arguing) RS

cap, again - on

the R (Russia) expects

to involve itself on
itself.

Prop. Draft:

Kingick

Schell

Huron

File

(Page
8-13-10)

File and the

(~~the~~ file → new winter

(with Engraved Shovels)

How to send a
Thin Capsule
to people 24300
years away

(after the great
meltdown is past —
to 100M, less?

or to 5000 years —
100,000 years

"The Court is not
a Swiss post"

but the SLOP is!

(A Empire is slow?
for a Republic —
and a republic
is now — turning

(The Party are not
all wrong — but to
plant me MNC 1000/
not me as "big gov,"
danger to republic!

Title

The Most Dangerous
Plans in the World
Plans

The Protestant
Cajitator

Charles P. Curtis
and Ferris Greenleaf

(Mead)

7-24

New book

Decision - whether
+ when to launch
ministers on subject
evening

(sub-ministers

land-ministers: begin
occasional

given
decision

(they begin
flight time)

8-13-10

To Edm:

What interest of the Air Force or SAC/SC
would be in any way reducing
calculating the effects of free with rules?

[on the contrary:

- it would ^{be} make the (CF!) war
plus look even more general

(2) reduce possibility of "limited, selective" attacks
or "controlled war" ^{possibility of that} CF or Lin War.

3) make all-out war look unwise,
with increased frictions or NCC WINTER
(see also, effects on open;
calculated?)

4) reduce "regional" workloads, vehicles, personnel
... budget ...

To focus only "why no calculation" is like
studying Holocaust though focus on "Why Babylon-B?"
or "was it efficiently done?"

Ask Edm: Consider the various reasons for not
occupying me as an associate
and implications of these for the "mission,"
or its prospects.

Aug. 6, 2010 en route to Hampton

NOTES:

We must try to avert: ¹ FU, ² terrorism, ³ proxy,
⁴ ~~hijacking~~ ⁵ ~~etc~~

~~The strategy~~ We will probably fail, sooner or
later. Yet we must try.* (We are not
certain to fail. What is certain?)

Here is what I have learned about the
obstacles to success, (or even postponement), why
we are likely to fail, and (but) why we must
try nevertheless and "could/might succeed"

Wegovy, to the very heart of our ability, &
accepting personal risk & cost, non-violently,
truthfully

* have to avert, not to postpone — without
making eventual partial success or worse inevitable.
(i.e. not of FU threats, continued armament and)

See climate change/global warming: Chris Hamilton

(or more 1, 2, 3
|| and we must try to avert ⁴ ~~even~~ if we fail
to avert #, 2, 3 ⁴⁵ ~~entirely~~: as is very likely.

(and hint danger — by means other than postponement
or of making postponement/else more likely (ABQ, CO:))

John Kennedy

Sunday
Oct 31, 10

see Washington advice: NO permanent alliance
(entangling, "interfering")

see Contingency
Afghanistan!

Berlin '48

(But the
could have
been Taiwan
starts War
(as well as
rises!)

Afghanistan - Iraq! (not Bosnia!)

the first Republican Wars in a century
(since Philip/Colum!): 1898/1900

Don Pass and Congress!

WWI, WWII, Korea, VN! (even Afghanistan etc)

WAS NATO "necessary"?

EU machines, threat?

What if no EU "

What if NO NATO?!

What if NO US participation in WWII?

(UK defaults on Morgan loans!

Morgan collapses!

Effects?

What if US stayed out of WWII? Invasion
First!

X

Rose ~~David~~ ~~Rosenbaum~~ Rosenbaum

How the East Begins S+D

March 2011

John Kemp publisher

Montclair

		Colours	drive 6:45
7:15	7:15	7:15	
7:45	7:45	7:30	
		8:00	
	9:15	8:25	

Ranial Scents

BS 10-19-10

- Vo. Orap - (Moscow)

- China? Back with R?!

- C-II has cost of replacing K (who had
also bluffed, and deprived mil. of parity)
with Regime — PARITY etc

(post-1964

not pre-1964,

but alone "sufficient"
of "Total RS cap"

(Shultz?)

Moscow Seizing?

- Also — RAND submission of text
ban in 1958 ("Big Hair" / Moscow)
and 1963 (vulnerability of infrastructure)

- lost K

- got Parity

- got MIRV

- back NPT! (Israel

Israel

Pak

NK

(Turkey?
Iran?)

- TV and Japan axes
(Israel?)

Eight
SD

- VS. D-L / Amptu / CF esp. after 1964

Parity?

Heavy; bluff / charade

—
—
—

All ABM
CD

B

^{contribution}
My cont. to our race:

~~My~~ Book (book)

1 - My Q&A - later FS plan!

essential, giving being
still genocidal (esp. after 1964)

(RAND: CF, D-L)

2. - ^{free} can't look at: Min Det

SLBMs vs. ICBMs

Gilpatrick program

(see)

poss. of test ban

" of agreed only

" " NFEU

" " NPT with test

" " reduction

(1961-62)

" " abolition

opposing IRBMs to Turkey

among IRBMs: RAN

fight-test ban

3. Gilpatrick spread \rightarrow C-II'

(no first test
of MIRV)

4. Albans / Ann Barbore

VFR on FS

(5. I didn't know: - Seaborn 1964

McN thinks 1965

BUT I DID:

the book
others

vs. China, India, Moscow, London, Japan:

BS Serials & cents
Monetary stay

Really offbeat

Per RU that - serious

(Did you know,
of the "dated" date)

"The point is not... and
post." Further

(Cheng + Ruffell!
(where was Paul +
Wolfe = 1969
1971?)

Sent - to right now

was in MHH

State of laws

Similar federal/jurisdiction (about H&R,
NS summary)

(Not forward on me!)

But see also 1968 books: NVOs for book

Aversion of NVN:

("if China comes")

R + McN, 1964

CNO & US, 1965

BS

If I had not copied NSSM-1
and given it to Matthews

N would have stayed in
office

and history would have been
more different than most
people can easily imagine.

(N use of power against a KVA
invasion in 1976 or 1977-78.

Having

(To say that at another would
destroy the book - ~~most~~ some would
put it aside.

Would it fail that as influential
after they'd read the book?

But I'm assuming - without Matthews,
(+ his not going it up at first)

Plumlee would not have made the
Friedly break-in - right? or not?

(and enough

young

LIPOY

Meeting?

and could not have been brought
up May 3
just before the news went
on W6
— we still don't know why!

But Belmont: What if I had
not also done copies NSSM-3

(so had published it!

might this (not) also have been
released — esp. to NAR's concern —
if he was (?) that concerned!

(If I'd published it (or even, NSSM-1)
wouldn't N have stepped in office?

(Who would have answered him?

if he would answer?

if not?

"all options"
also believe ?!

(He had to believe & would have
would over, unless you know
the "whole story" — which
few know we do!

(Both FS/SIOP and FU?

MAH?

Hush?

not Schell

Engelhardt?

Who?)

Parr? Melby?

GET NSSM-3

and subsequent studies!

NESC studies, "years"!

Burton-Storck, Jeff Cohen: 10-20-10

"I'm already against the next war."

See 1973 film, "I. F. Stone's Weekly"

ADD

Barrel Secret (ES)

Mandy night
10-18-10

- 1958 Jell / RAND Physics Div.

kills CTB; again, 1963

Edith could have stopped SU (CBOMs
(at 4? 10? 100?) + limited MIRV

(Newton Bone? ^{Col} RTF

Test Bone

Myth Oct - Humphreys

~~NPT~~ NPT

RAND report (+ mine

↓

FS Plans!

Group

(Assume as the Secret Principal

- ~~\$~~ helping secrets escape from
digital prisons / dungeons / safes
(sublittles)

gillnet

(If I didn't have PP -

N/HAR wouldn't have a possession
of this ent does as a threat!

via - "SIOP" (NSSM-3 -

to that with HAR

meant, to ODE?!

(No need to renew does to
hypothetical that!

via. Query: MHH, IV

can quote from declass version
one quotes!

any non-declass needed?

Exena

W/ gun control?

"page"

(W/ nre control?)

(W/ a one war

or terrorist bank is US → biological recession

SAVE the cities?

(delay tipping points?

like recession of 2008?

[see us as: pre-WWI Russia

Germany

I am in position of

Hansen, or Chris Hamilton

(Rising for a Planet) on CLIMATE;

or Krugman on LONG RECESSION

Japan in 1977 or Berlin?

Rwanda/Burundi/Congo?

Yugoslavia in (when? 1900?

1980?

213 And I go through "stages" (?) of grief?

Aug. 6 (2010)

First look was to jointly Hiroaka + Ray
(if lies)

Shot being down (if stream/current/
we 6B, w. hst) of 1946? (after Navy) → SIOB

H+N are used also to jointly use policy!

Oct 8-10

Book

(dram)

3 Spus of PS

prevention

prevention

resistors

most

likely

(see further than correct threat

(FU - prevention (Kern!

- etc

Kern!
Pak?!

- (prevention?)

India?

11-1-10

Re Def

Ongun (deaths,
killed)

=

imminent!

for us;
not, Agnes,
we are:

example? - proof

16-19-10

Hyp. the S-r, narrow
self-interest of
special interests

Can get (despite L-r,
broad cuts,
dangers)
news to "others")
FU threats / wars
Doomsday Machine
global warming

Event will happen pop bet
in 200 years? Extras?

(Pop. "bubble": Cbr bubble
Hawaii; fossil fuels

See me/RAND on
me over

2 neo-cons on ME
(after, 1979-80)

Requirement for
(total) stability:

1) neither side
(US-R; Back India!)

can "bump" (limit
danger) by preventing
going 1st \rightarrow going
2nd.)

(exists now &
since 1965-68)

2) Neither side
believes 1st \rightarrow 2nd
for itself

3) neither believes the
other believes 1st \rightarrow 2nd for the

(2 & 3 do not
exist.)

Can there be ordered
be unilateral
action of one side?
or, reciprocal
action?

+ then, minimized
(← New Winter)

Decoupling Reaction

Neither US nor R
can have the other

to involve a region
central to the other:

- Berlin (!)
- West Europe

[In contrast to:

Israel

Pak

(Kashmir?)

(Hengzhou / Ukraine)

[EU now open as in its
space: clear it over? = CUBA

(Why isn't India
still a multi-ethnic-
national state

even if it gives up
Kashmir?

- What does Kashmir
want - independence?
or Pak?

(How many units do
we in India? Would
they shift, - if it went
to Pak?) 3)

Agrees: Report w. Pak

typ: — both have
only sub fences.

[“need” for 3 or 2
strat. fences:

2 series

(a cost of independent
air fence, actually
ICBMs (same, if
any controlled ICBMs)
(What if truly
unfired and fences ?!)

2. But:

R depends on ICBMs;
~~but~~ no mutual brink
(impaired) US SCBMs/
commanders

to much less than
total R ICBM forces
(so no ^R incentives
to prompt — "war or
lose")

Sunday
Oct 19-10

We could: initiate

- (1) Declare NFU;
2) destroy time miss
in Europe
for anti-prolif)

2) ^{Destroyer +} Destroy ICBMs

3) limit SLBMs
to below R-ICBMs

4) Reverse ~~AB~~ SMD
no. ICBMs

(return us - MRBMs?)

5) Dead Hand: High threshold
launch trigger: 10 detections

(Other countries will
not give up EU
threat: Israel
Pale
(NR?)

get Cohen

ask Raminas

about lecturing

& universities / agent

10/19/10

What of discourse?

1) System can be
triggered: with by
SU "provocation"

(- brights SU traps

= (or loc:

~~2~~ ~~III~~ - false alarm (FK)

o - still

- warning of Europe
(or Berlin!)

o - (warning of)

SU PS

- SU too much (or II?)

o - UA (over the ground)

8/19/10
Austin Hall Fort St. V. Kest H. Kest

2) Damsky Nature:

600M Fire

Nice Winter

(bill + smoke upstated!

→ ice! ~~epidemic~~ (?)

Ozone

banish

3) JCS (US humors)

know + ventral

Damsky upstated!

(see Atmos. formation)

Nice Winter

Ozone

massacre

Bat
Oct 16-10
Bumil Skunk

Monatomin^{ALHH} + me
+ N's me Thanto
/

Aug 3 + " "

+ Randy
Bumil knew: my plan
did Nesson know? not
(off/dere on plan?)

NE knew by briefing
1971: Chap 2! (+)
TR knew dere, not plan

NESSON TRANSCRIPT

May 3⁷² and NSSM-1
(TCS + HAR - was
~~Handwritten~~ ~~Handwritten~~!)
(Salisbury)

Public
Blanchard, Handwritten
Handwritten (as RAND
website)

my TS after minutes
Handwritten NSSM-3
see Delegation)

Pantridge / Handwritten / COG

1980 / 1981-83 (Handwritten
+ 4.5)

Milpatone...

Denial
(last plant: 1969
NSSM-3

But: Denial Hook

Monies (other?)
(Kintall, Burr SH

Anubis

(1954+ - areas + VN

Barb

Patricia

Saturday
10-16-10

BURIED SECRETS

Confessions of a
Nuclear War -
Planner

The Hidden Story
of Nuclear War
Planning

VX

Mass Murder Mystery

Rosenthal

PP + news: censorship
get GPO edition
(an issue?)

(Kym Adles?)

Kyrgyz

NT (New York)

S.

N TAPES + NUOS

(Declaro!)

Challenge class.

DAVID YOUNG

Krogh: mt + SIOF

Russ

Sunday

Call Serphus
Rosa

Rosa - talk?

see Colvin

(look at Nixon)
book

Fischer

Nemt talks

10043100453540

M25 2009 320 2102

Kard

google: DE + uniafili
(JOE?)

[my car with HAT 70 -
same as with LBJ 68

Roskin - Almost, are there

Dec. 7, 2010 (Pearl Harbor Day:
on Dec. 7, 2011
1941


The 70th Anniversary of " "
2) Eliminate the incentive (on either side)
for a nuclear Pearl Harbor
under any conditions of punishment,
deterrence, etc., or false alarm
AND the ^(b) perso. of nuclear
winter (either local or global)
[NOT: global ozone depletion]

By 1) Unilaterally eliminating US
land-based ICBMs

2) Reducing SSBM warheads* to levels
that did NOT threaten to "eliminate" to
"dangerously low" levels the Russian
land-based ^{ICBMs} missiles

OR cover use with

esp. when (3) targeting of "two meg cities"
("hinterland") is avoided: i.e. not
targets near or in cities.



+ hinterland
STOKES CITY
= NUC WINTER

LIKE NUC WINTER

[Suppose atmo. is. very basically
conditionally, with some/considerable
warming (depending on nuclear, ^{height of burst} yield, type
of warhead
+ TARGET!]

[+ (4) NFW

clin of US too much

+ (5) inspiration of NWS (Only)

see Blair et al op-ed today,
12-2-10 is NYT on absl.

- (+ see Cohen about google

(Does H-bomb threaten me
winter? Hand over heart/fire
does it generate?

How this has calculated?

(front effect?)

Re: Forster
Hogri Calculator

Steinbrun?
Blair?

- and see WSI op-ed!

Absl. impossible

Re-mobilize
Russoin (and what
Europe) analysts
of NWOT

because it doesn't meet reality
units of small NWS
from conventional attacks
(unless latter abnorted)

Underlined:
NWOT
as alternative
to "defense"

Dec 6-7, 2010 State cables

- see NATO plans for defense of Baltic states!

— (Has about = working with Russia?!)

(Georgia? Ukraine? Possible break up of
Russia? (Chechnya...)) Stons?! (oil)

can't action
from Osama?
Final Mexico!

me Book

Dec. 7, 10

After Chap. 5, 600 M

II

A. How did we get to this?

1)

A to H difference; discussing

H: ^{Exiled}
GAC
Kibbutz
Compton

no fences

"no first test" (1st) Nov 1982

"huddle/
choice
mixed

2) Critics:
as targets

WWII

fire bombing

→ fire storms

Vommyutt

Tokyo + 67

↳ Atomic rate

Marshall, Nov 4/

Tokyo 1923

III

B. Actual efforts

1) Fire against (despite: WWII H)

→ 1.2 B?

Self?

(Arat)

2) New Writers

1983

2000+

(21 years after
C-II)

Before or later than II?

→ on a Rain-trigger

D-L

Vulnerability of forces
on both sides

C³ vulnerability on both

("Capt. Misp"
Leigh Allen
Regiment)

→ Rank of "Adapters" (UA: 2-man units
...)

no "stop" order

no P&Ls

→ Use Winter D.N.'s (≈ others. lg.)

for evolution: citing
Pop.

* || catch species:
situations

decision for US

* "neutral"

C-II

Wg would

1) ~~attack~~ downing another US plane

→ invasion?

(not for attacks on all SAMs/
MRBMs)

2) Invasion (not maybe)
attacks on MRBMs!)

→ FROGS as Invasion force
(Workbooks answer!)

Not a "necessary" part
of crisis; we general
NOT; or delegation

(MURATO!

Penalty!

(MUR/JOR

CONCERN:

steps to
prevent!)

3) WHY a are our invasion force

for 1 ~~MRBM~~ on US - Ben Solomon

JOR/speech...

→ full-attack?

Problem: so much of the region (event, kind - and)
policies are awful, crazy, hopeless, half-assed
mistaken, dangerous, bankrupting country...

no conviction: it's because they could let
what has been relatively kept secret and
successfully hid about for so long...

yes, the very part of strategy & lies (even of
"good" policy that requires strategy (as in
a first, overcoming wars) hints & threatens
discovery — that's accepted and unavoidable
↓

but the broad, broad & reliable strategy —
intentional of the individual concerning, negotiation
and coverage of visitors with one white's
approach & where it's going and what they're
doing

1:10 - 1:30

~~Julius Kiehl~~

strategy is — gives us corporate
disasters & crisis, and in general, those plus
unnecessary, unjust wars, from "the price
of living," from increased MIC/militarism,
& the death of discovery (Kerry, Chile,
Indonesia... US?!)

Paul Daley

"Have you read a comparable business
account — from any bank?"

Wf not? Ass!

(My previous accounts have all been signed.)

Cf. MCA, MGB, Henderson, Hm. Butler
all permitted

9.

[Cite sales of Schell, et al
(Brockman!)]

cite references to read or review the book

Is X impossible?

How danger of all-out war disappeared?

Regional wars? (see efforts!)

Does present posture/policy increase
risk of terrorism, or not?

Reduce chance to reduce prob or
stop prelim — or not?

Effects of one war?

(NK? see above, NK-SK Nov 27, 10)

TD 95
Anders

|| see years as a symptom of "National
rationality" (or realism, caution: attempt state
as well as endangering the state!)

TD 98 GWS + BAK Ochs can do 2-2 planning: to 2025
to stay in Afghanistan, Iraq!
rebuilding our infrastructure, weapons!
^{we} as START world \$80B program?!
(Can we stop that?)

109: [The founding myth (for Americans) of the
nuclear era -

that the Bomb had ended the longest
war in history and only the Bomb could have
done so, (without invasion)

We have not ended this civil war -
about "unwise influence" of MIC

(see 1961! 1962!

[Would the have built 1000 AM-
after Sept. 61?

N? Yes, yes - all the way -
in Sixties!

C-II (Would it have occurred?)

Why reluctant to read or ruin the book?

Hyp: We are so far from reducing the degree
of arms (that of abol.) - in ways that do
look politically possible, feasible, ~~achievable~~
or of coming to increase the + obviously
or prevent prolif desirable

that it seems unthinkable to read
about how ^(b) to abolish (that "exist")
which looks read possible, in my opinion
and arguably impossible
perhaps not even desirable

TD gives best account of why (a) is urgent,
obligatory, is S-T, wid-th

And why en (b) is possible, desirable,
an aim to reduce degree maximally
to near-zero

(pursuit or in aiming en to
reduce prolif)

though degree could be greatly reduced
- from outrageously, unforgivably high (even if
"improbable") beyond that it would be
of unilateral US action should be
and US-R bilateral action (not treaty!)

The point is not just that we should ^{con +} "aim further"
than we start on, say, 1000 vs. 1500 weeks
"to abolition"

but that we are going in wrong direction,
making things worse (both BHO, as well as GHB)
not doing anything we need to.

We aren't reducing real dangers

↳ TD shows they are real,
and will get worse

C-27-10

Wf wasn't there
was a wall
was since 1945?

(like "Wf wasn't
there a Wall It.
collapse after 1980-
81, after 1987?

after many little
collapses?

(see Crisis of 1910-14!)

(Kins doesn't answer - but
he was fooled!)

"The numbers
usually given—
1 or more billion
of almost everyone—
are all wrong:
myths...

...no assurance it
won't "collapse its
ever" next year!

—
—
—

(e.g. the "balance" in 1959—
~~substantially~~ stable?)

C-II: ---!

- Cuban AA!
- Foot K full. only,
no car accident
- One ~~was~~ man
in low sub!

1972? B-52 sweeps?

- offent caution,
more than one
figured (Quemoy;
Shubin...
- Moratorium '69

NOT:

NFD

Outstanding

Stable dot

= Fifteen

NAD (no.

Amputation,
D-L)

2-man rule

no delegation

tight control

K caution/critical

(no workbooks

no MRBOLs on track

Bloc...

Fall-out on US
"the war must end."

"Johnson"

"Lamoral"

"orders will be
disobeyed"

"Kronental"

(Compare:
efficient workers")
~

7-6-10

Was

Refers:

- Krugman: - heartless
- clueless
- confused

What is BHO?

Are cutthroats:

- understated price/
scale

(TM)

≈ BP "April" ("book"
or ?)

≈ regional

≈ Katrina

(both: BP)

5-16-10

FB (Hawfman)

"If we couldn't
shorten VN (with
draft, Movement(s),
SSIC KIA)

How can we
shorten Adglan?"

So - if we (authorities)
can't offset S-R Expe
(or less)

|| (unless we meet for
me 9-11: PNAC
* an event: TDA; for
mobil.)

why not put out
on a S-R process
change of values,
institutions (media)?

NWOT

Conversion

anti-Empire

campaign financing

as if we had time!

Final and mobilize
available opposition to
us: EU, about all

strategic

(What mil. argument
can be made for US
land-based missiles?

on "D-6"?

Alert?

1000-1500 warheads?

(CANNOT WEIGH IN

WITH STRAT. ADVICE/
CRITIQUE?)

or (Hemlock?)

April 5, 2010

D-L/CF used
to be required for
(linked to) FU thrusts,
not only US-SU

but for every all
thrusts, since they were
every all potentially
under an SU rule
umbrella

(potential SU 2d-use
after US FU...

needed to defend
on SO over umbrella:

But now, ~~no~~ ^{both} ~~to~~
countries interested
Russia are under a
Russian over
umbrella —

So D-C vs. Russia
is not resolved, to
wake FU threats
vs. them
D-C + FU are

de-bited, except
for EU threats
vs. Russia.

and when would
we "use" them?

R vs. Georgia?

Ukraine?

(Central Asia: 'them'?)

⇒ only need to prevent
a Russian FS on US: a
false alarm — which

are positive steps
possible?

Better: ^{Hyp:} Radical steps
to level that would
probably survive a US
FS now!

(e.g. X rules with
1-3 workbooks now!)

When can we do we
and FU?!

(in contrast to: Forest,
Park

Delegation

NYT Mag (Hawdale)
New Yorker
Humphreys? (Atlanta?)
Math Jones!

WPT proceedings

✓ Mason

✓ Reznick

Fred Daley

Knicker

Slater

get papers

Thursday 5 10

US

PO Pers of the Gov
ever told us the
truth about
nuclear war.

No official of any
free state (inter of
state)

(No cabinet or legis. has
known - or DECIDED

No official of any state.
remained free.

("the truth"?) created a
commission,

No ~~of~~ Pers has created
any; give a talk; ~~say~~ say say

Survey (see #5
answers)

(Compare to public
reservation)

[A movie? see new
one - Blair

John to

Consequences

Purposes

is the "option"

W&S "to prevent

(answers)

"to be (the) Option"

By them:

my
hitting?
intensity
honesty

(non-computer)
Decision with wanting
(My decision... RAND)

Blackmail

Reve War

Crisis - Anticipation
VH...

→ areas

Reve Am Central / Design

Security / dis / WB

FB reacts to me, on me,
as if want to 5-17-10 bi
on "death ~~and~~ life crisis,
FB: positive (perhaps "moral"
— on me: "absolutist,"
vegan
— & (DE) have crisis
w/ my trials
(Half War,
long
from (2006-10))

— Risk of all-out war
has gone down (in
5-17) [but: over
time...!]

— "Workbooks have been
reworked" (yes, BUT...)

- BHO will keep
moving (NO

- BHO will not ^{NO} threaten
or launch (not sure)

- World opposed against
proliferation ("except from";
unless ~~less~~ from gets
over) NO

- Use is delegitimizing;

TABOO

(NO)

ROLE OF
USE (RUSSIA)

(MY MESSAGE to China ~~man~~ ^{man} -
IN HANSEN TERMS
intents: NOC DANGER = COYATE
DANGER)

(Schall): "We've now
come close... despite
crimes & art-works."

NO

(FB on climate: "We
have somehow managed
thus far to avoid
using nuclear weapons
[NO] since Hiroshima
without changing the
consciousness that
produced them" ("Century
to Exist" ^{NO})

We must change out
only what we see
(about boat + current
risk

[thAlarms WERE
exaggerated; there
was no great risk
of new war — no use for
arms, and NWS came
back to Am this; potential
NWS must be helped to
see that "NOT TRUE
and not any what we THINK is,
but what we CARE about, and
OUR POLITICAL POWER

and ability to RESIST
the messages of the
MEDIA! + Pubs!

("They moved through
the institutions!")

Unlikely climate,
Warning l-r risks
of ~~heating~~ and that we
does not intend

S-r sovereign or risk
for almost any of us!!

(Some will "risk" of
what? for whom?) [Israel]

Oril (even) & Mergel
movement "success"?

Is BHO Admin really
more open to influence
of "us"?

~~There are~~ Private sect.
and formal ideas reflect
the measured claims
and purposes/priorities,
the "rational decision-
making" of (the most)
powerful people + institutions.

Continuing up-dated:
NOT just

- overbrowsing / inventa
(except rationals:
auto-dated since 1989:
link between US & EU vs.
TW countries (allies of
SU) and FS cap.)

- Freedom of movement, restriction

- Expressing inhibits
(“first come first served”)
or exclusionary OMC, and
(the longer)

(don't pol, ideology:
see VV/Catbs/"loss of
China":

often us. frog
role of Israel

Pales / Hamas / Ukrainian
us - SU = CW (new?
~ "Berlin"!)]

Carbon inquiries
(see Israel)

Dupe

Turkish + South Korea
lobbying competition)

Is it "too late" to try to
abandon imperialism?

(Still costly and
dangerous — vs. PNAC —
despite/after downfall
of Sov. empire!

(It was not only,
warning, or critically
aid, ~~but~~ ^{disruption} + ~~imminent~~
from SO that fueled
TW, anti-Chinese,
"imperialism" (vs. US/
Western prophets - Arguing,
happens, or is the problem.
MULTILATERALISM (M&N)

But is it too late
to cut the link
between Europe and
Asia: EC + FS?

("The Dearly Conversation")
(Can Americans be brought
to see 1) Europe

2) the connection to ~~Europe~~
Asia

(via FS/SAC)

3) Just what is the
significance Asia
Europe (Berlin overall
"crisis" — "no-one organized"
significance Asia some plans)
or has benefited? (Berlin, SAC,
SAC/OAE) US role in Europe

first as Israeli
and "protect
Israeli social policy,

US and protect

"Big America (now)

(in "Little England

Big England

Protect American"

ASK/TELL: By whom,
why, and how are
these and policies created,
maintained, protected?

(Not just IGNORANCE, IN-

ATTENTION; greed, power, status
INSECURITY OF

(us. Frintone/Behr...)

* key: knowing (understanding)
motivation is NOT

"How long are 'live'"

"in memory + intent,"

but "what group are

we part of + how

(power?) (more than, "part of

what group effort/goal/
cause/success" or

"how long with it

remain, or its

achievements last or

be remembered"?)

(We are acting like
"good guys" — who
stepped in Europe,
did not retreat)

(or "good guys" in
Israel & US — ~~the~~
supporting policies that
our ^{to Israel} probably fatal
is L-R; nice as USG
~~promotes~~ promotes
peace, terrorism, SU/R
ans, risk of WWII

[What part of the
brain / nervous
system) Registers
CONCERN, CARE, or
positive ATTENTION
(not Fight or Flight,
or Love, or ...)

Is it all fault of
an "uptight" brain?
or of "pre-frontal
cortex"? (Psychopaths?)
("Hyp: We are all psychopaths
/ un-empathetic or even
w/ some things, PEOPLE,

Exp. during
work-day:

our roles in
social institutions.

Unconscious, unexamined,
and self ignorant,
roleless - no loyalty,
"conscience," scruples,
negotiation of the
rights / wants / desires / fears
or habits / expectations;

MOSS: (FB)

The making/purchase
of our books will (may)
"continue" to prevent the
"use" — of ^{rather} ~~best~~ the
law — of arms:
too + strategic.

Not only the weapons, not
the "use," but the
risks of accident,
UA have been consciously
prevented, ^{various} ~~various~~!
+ PROLIF (~ known)
"that" - DM "
RATIONAL

It is not enough
to "mimic" or
"mimic."

Our human nature
is problematic

Human "plants,"
flexible, it ought
from to be —

At present (and in
past) it has
motivated with herms
or degen

(viz. the human response
to "big in power.")

People can be induced
& genuinely motivated
(en masse) by
leader-inspired FEAR.
(In fact, FB and
Furber are opposed to this!)

It is human (predictable
behavior, in "crisis" hours)
as leaders to 1) power
personnel / team (human parts)
own Problems; 2) out to
be universal about "Others"
(beginning) at all; 3) power on
S-R

(i.e. "be human")

and (4) to risk cost
destruction to society,
world, others; + even
Partner or self:

to avoid certain
S-r personal loss ^{BLAME}
(of status, power; security; OR
[or avoid MEMBERSHIP]
[even to, risk loss -

if certain ^{of avoidance} is available
(lexico) [value for
to 50; 9 from 1 to

[? to reduce risk of I-E
loss by small amount? NO?]

(non-R.C.)

5) prone to be persuaded
that it is necessary,
just, moral, obligatory
(or convenient: an "option")
to kill other humans

1-3 characteristics of
(other) animals, too
as less, for humans:

They are also prone,
& more so, other "choices"

(ODDS AGAINST on
choosing the 'but not so.

4-
5-B not in on self-interest:
only odds on HUMAN.

5-17-18

or concerned
about us in
b-r!

Being compassionate,
acting compassionately,
toward others against
the desires/orders of
our Kings or our
"community" (misappropriated
"benevolence"!)
is dangerous; risks
Costly, loss of
UNLIKELY support,
states, or even
membership
"behavior" ("treason")
- about
UNTHINKABLE
UNFEELABLE
(can't cry or love!)
genuinely INHUMAN

yes, I ^{do} have an agenda ("like Keynes' Grail"
(Dmy Holodets, #7-10)

and it is not, "to prepare for the
market" or de-regulation

Economists
(in guise of
"science" (bureaucrats)
astronomers)

or to support a PR,

party
PR agency

or "analysis/
logic"
with

or M/C/ans even
or empire

Wakken to me: May 27, 1998

I told Wakken + Iversley in about 1993
(early Clinton!)

One purpose of my life was to reduce
~~the~~ "probability for war" (virtual?) by, say, 1%

(NOC WAR, esp.!) 11

✓ [WG thesis wasn't published:

see film MDMA, from (1962 - C-II)
and esp. 1964-75. 13 yrs.

I'm, anti-one action, to influence "prob." (anti-)
of one war in the way that prob. of
continuation and escalation of VN war.

+ prob. of invasion of
El Sal, Cuba, Nicaragua

/ (very high prob, as of 1967-1973 (esp. of Blunder
"real")

my efforts began (act, 69-72)

1968 (Nov 22) for activities

was reduced!

(WB + movement + Congress

+ prospect of imminent
resignation

Failure, except for ABM (not me), INF and CTB
signing
Europe, CTB, me

as in VN!

Few realize how
much bigger and worse
things could have gotten!

Kept a lid on "defense" expenditures, MX,
test / proof, Pershing/CMs in Europe,
N-bank

(Nun - more than I could have
said, at first thought!)

COVERT
(this actual proof, priority, of leaders
and this sense of "allowable actions" (as leaves,
censures, etc. ... (and this ability to keep
secret, and inclusion to his + overseas
citizens, women + children,
population opinion)

like financial
system

She would (leaves, civilization, inc. US — have been and
are in much greater danger than almost anyone
realizes (like poor in New Orleans; Gulf states, Iran and spill on

OK: 1975 - 2001: anti-war (PSR-1992-95
anti - Rwanda, Kosovo, Bosnia
invasion of Iraq (1990-91),
Central America (1980's),

Mozambique, 1999
~~2000~~
social

Mozambique 199(5)-97-2002 (not
9-11,
Afghanistan)
(Iraq 2001)

(Iraqi embargo 1989; (but Gulf War)

JFK: chance of sure war (of SC being willing to go to sure war)

between $\frac{1}{3}$ and even.

X How could he bet against war?

McG B on prospect of success of RT:

a) between — — —

b) even if it loses, we win ...

(positive domain :)

(not really? in prospect, or in practice)

"compared to 'doing nothing' now:

sure S+ loss)

an option entirely in my domain

(the prob. of sure war was > 0 —

though JFK thought not: over-estimating his control (and knowledge) of situation

(He made a commitment he would not have made — too risky, if he had known K's lack of control of AA — and SAM! Castro)

and a commitment to JCSV (not shoot-down to K — go all the way: can't control JCS)

then, over-estimating his control of Castro through K (though he did control K more than he expected — because

K couldn't control Castro or JFK, he could only respond post to JFK's ults) by changing what he could control (against Castro's wishes — without consulting him).

— What I have & learned since 1960

not just with the conceptual
framework & and the
— on DT
{ — on US role
} on world

but give what's happened, what I've learned,
e.g. the "crisis analysis of strat. change" (1960?)

as opposed to the really existing world
of SU (4 ICBMs)
and US (expanding; 40 → 1000MM)
EU thanks of US
(cost, k!)

the end result!

|| (i.e. one unit : see implications
for "critical paragraphs"! "National zero"

US

social

2010

Edm

1. Can't get low (<500) — but closer to zero —
without dropping an air beyond/other than (Type I)
det D-L/Implosion (distinct from FU, though
vs. Russian, "unreal" for (real) credibility
of FU stands vs. Russian
on spirit nations under
Russian umbrella, if any.

2. Yes (Edm). It is nec. but not suff. (to get
to low numbers) to forgo FU (vs. Russian)
and Warsaw Pact:
(not, vs. ~~Edm~~ from NK)

3. FU considerations (where, why? how?) are, &
suspect, "compartmentalized" from FS considerations, which
are nationalistic differently: D-L/Implosion "if war
is inevitable, is a crisis"

without asking why it became inevitable:
namely, US had launched FU } vs. SU, or SU
or was considering doing so } ally
(THREATENING: hopefully, not, even, to be carried out)
≥ functions entirely different from determining
one attack

4. Reagan: "1985" "New war cannot be won"
BUT (OOD) Danger can be limited.
Compared to what?
How best?

X A tradition of use in threats
"of non-use"

is. trial: Elin US land-based missiles

Reduce R warheads (land-based)

Reduce number & size/weight^{little bit}
of US warheads

(don't transfer to Min R
missiles)

(eg. 5^{10?} warheads for sub,
3-4 subs!)
or 4-6

Sale purpose: no D-L - which is to keep FU
vs. R
Leave, no FU toward R

(+) NEU no. others

Who do we potentially threaten with FU?

(Not R: not UK, F, Israel, China, India
Pot? NK: Russia)

Restrictions are up against a barrier what strat.
weapons
1) D-L not "on a roll." + short
2) BMD

High: de-MIRVing MM is a good development;
but: 1) elim MM or 2) limit SCBMs

No FU

ADD No disarming FS cap. vs. Russia!

(Malty not of FU — including Russia —
USSR — and its clients — was a requirement
for cutting arsenal to below 1000/500.

Since 1989: imposed reductions in R
to < 500

and no R allies under R "umbrella"!

(no need to deter R (SU) around — we
want allies.

So — we could retain FU (vs. Iran; NK...
while cutting arsenal to < 500. Pol?)
(by dropping D-L/FS vs. Russia)

But we shouldn't reject NEU

(as BHO has just done)

LEAK/Investigate:

1) Who was for, & against NEU?
Arguments?

2) What controversies are "wrong" about NEU?
Which want it?

3) Environmental impact of 1) lim. FU

2) ¹⁰⁰⁰⁻1500 weapons! (D-L?!) HOAX

Contrary to NPR

Dem ≠ NK ("Axis of Evil")
^{broader}
(Dem ≠ NK or Pot (or Saudis!))

"Top priority to NP —

except for forgiving all the most
afflicted nations!

(Top priority to O-L! FS!)

Why, now?

NOT TRUE ON CW

Not, strategies, Jan 1989 2(pgs)

For writing Doors
Members: JOBS (profiles)
in Services
Congress
WH
Communities

Just: MLC Civ. Congress
Services unions
communities
MM sales
in ...)

Type II Det is enrichment

(Can Find Saboteur
in Dem...

// Not useful to maintain Empire
(as seen, FU?) after CW!

(Hudson, note!

The Dem Connection
has been reversed!
CW/ Empire

Except for very small forces:
Too or Stout
(as small FU of others)

Fundamental: need for EIS (Environmental Impact
Statement (EIS?))

for use of 1

10

50

100

needs

year

or R

D-L as a box, bluff, since 1965

(Always has good than limiting
SU areas — along with areas!
and making change of exchange,

NO "65-yr trend." of area-use

Threat to from to use!

and hardly the first!

Trend of use in lands

(Example to others

and essential to others to help!

(As long: suff. to require FS exp.)

START recognize actual requirements of areas

for D-L — while intending D-L and the
area for 1500 years!

of 28 10

All are massing Ukraine, Poland,
Romania, Georgia
against R conventional attacks
of EU threats vs. R?

AND R needs D-L!

(as we do) and D-L/FS!

Contradicts my notes above!

200 units in Europe...

(as - Germany, Norway, Sweden, Belgium?
Netherlands

How about: NAU vs. Russia

(as, for UK, F, Israel

India (Pol? NK?)

China?

Else, R too much deployed.

[to, India, Pol not mentioned
while "Iran = NK"

No action of US EU think vs. TW!

(STILL!
Iran!

non-Waraw
Post

p. 14

AAA! Pretends that it maintains RU
threat only against "conventional or CBW
attacks" ^{of} ~~from~~ ^{by} ~~from~~ or other states not party
in conflict with NATO)
But real threat is a pretext
threat on Iran! (to NK)

Vital interest of ... US? NO! "Ally" — Israel!

Should?

(?)

NO

So — we are warning RU threats us.
— Iran possession or near-possession
(NK? bluff) close approach

(?)

NO

— Mexico Russia, to deter R non-nuc
attacks on its neighbors, former
Warsaw Pact members.
(China, and OS/D-L conf.)

Example to obligator (e.g. India, Pak;
and Vietnam) 4

inc. incentives for R and US to
maintain D.M.'s on alert!

and good environment for terrorist operation
(for Pak, R...)

Alternatives to CW were nearly all by-passed
as focus of D.M.'s. see 1961-63

Some forward

NFU

sole purpose (as D-L?)

larger reduction? "

WHO?

Pres?

eliminating land-based missiles

Do the others — meaning Soviet — support goal
of Abol. at all, ever — or massive reduction
WHO? What interests? USSR not

How reduce the
influence?

USSR ever?

~~CONVERSION~~ CONVERSION, reduction of influence over
~~USSR~~ USSR regime: US forgo empire

and others do so!

Does Abolition require this?

Practically (bridge against
speaking, yes other conventional competition)

WHO such US are umbrella is under way
of NRU?

Who but East Europe?!

(Central Asia?)

From SU!

If as content do better than the of now
- when + we will be "be able" to do better,
a real change

from D-L/FS/about/for other/World/
RU (and as CTR, FMC)

Deportive 1964 46 yrs ago

"school" = "Public after
closing Government
all (Crest.)


Schall

(US will be remembered for
the US Coast

+ the Bomb

slam
pencil

(in conflict)



De
Monday April 12 5 AM
Post-CW

During CW, US was defensive wrt
SU sphere - didn't really try to roll-back
(seen as too dangerous, infeasible:
Real Aug Warsaw Pact
SU never
Comm controls ^{over West} (see attempts at Ch - NVN)

1948
(Marshall Plan: only token gesture at
roll-back in East Europe: SU warns down
East.

If no nukes:

SU takes Berlin

NVN takes SVN

SU expands in Iran and ME

(Turkey?)

No division of Germany? (Korean?
Hippoman)

SU + US do nibble at each other's
edges; Comm frontiers (France, Italy; Iran?
[China, big: 1948-49; NVN, SVN...]

But mostly US focuses on assuring subcontinent
(mostly disintegrated) regions vs. separatists, bordering
nationalists in TW: with comm/effort of ^{for} ~~from~~
forming "Comm" regions. (see Dom Rep, 1965) China, East

After CW:

US becomes expansionist

aggressive

[Needs more for this?

not really; invention

services

MIC

NC: "Mafia principle": no independent powers

- Strong ^{after} into Kuwait (SH + next foreign

balance of power given

from light)

(Why does NC discuss claim (Nazi/Pony)

that Center gave given light to SH

us. from? Because of ongoing argots

with from? (look at JFK not Cuba, 1962)

2 tracks)

- from

US needs to "roll-back" (not SU/Cons, but)

independent TW regions;

regime change (not because of

non-democratic regimes, but non-

subservient regimes (see Feroz Ali,

Clash of Civilizations)

like Hitler & "Japan" (Tojo? Who?)

US sets out to reverse positions of weaker

regions (not neighboring, like Hitler/Japan;

global reach, whole world) by force, occupation

(not only CA). ME

Conventional reasoning

(Nitzge, Aug of 4 (at least, 2 or 3 - not HAK)
refers, we do it and agree for this.

+ Israel (Mediterranean principle vs. Iran)

(NC decisions - working? - influence
of Israel [Turkey?] on NC-conc.

Oil

Pipeline

(Israel)

bases

dope (heroin

cocaine

(Is this a factor opposing
legalization?

Loss of profits from dope
going to support of US CA
and US-favored groups + Ngin,
and US banks.

(NC: power of financial sector for growth
than that of industry, as shown in
collected over - - - (?) (over NC)